

Remarks/Arguments:

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed October 29, 2007.

SUMMARY OF APPLICANT'S AMENDMENT

The present reply amends Claims 1-11, 18, 20, and 25; and adds claims 26-28, leaving for Examiner's present consideration Claims 1-28.

SPECIFICATION

The Specification was objected to because of informalities. Accordingly, the Specification has been amended as shown above. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claim 20 was objected to for informalities. Accordingly, Claim 20 has been amended as shown above. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §101

Claims 1-10 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 for being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Accordingly, Claims 1-10 and 25 have been amended as shown above. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-10 and 25, as amended, conform to the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §102

In the Office Action mailed October 29, 2007, Claims 1-6, 9-13, 16-20, and 23-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Patterson (U.S. Patent No. 7,093,005 B2).

Claims 1, 11, and 18

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define the embodiment therein as comprising *wherein the first user interface is also operable to extend the domain; and wherein extension of*

the domain is based on an extension template. Claims 11 and 18 have been similarly amended to more clearly define the embodiments therein as comprising *updating the domain based on an extension template*; and *wherein the extension template is customizable*. Applicant respectfully submits that these features are not disclosed in or made obvious by the prior art.

In Patterson, a blueprint (“DNA”) can specify the basic building blocks and the logical relationships between the building blocks that make a data center. The DNA may specify roles of servers in a data center, and the relationship of the various servers in the roles. A role may be defined once and then re-used within a data center definition. For example, a Web Server role may be defined in terms of the hardware, operating system, and associated applications of the server. (Column 9, lines 54-59). Patterson does not, however, disclose extension templates as defined in the embodiments of Claims 1, 11, and 18. Extension templates can be used to update an *existing* domain with additional applications, services, components, and startup/shutdown classes.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1, 11 and 18, as amended, are neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-6, 9-10, 12-13, 16-17, 19-20, and 23-24

Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 2-6, 9-10, 12-13, 16-17, 19-20, and 23-24 are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim and further in view of the additional features of these claims. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 2-6, 9-10, 12-13, 16-17, 19-20, and 23-24 are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §103

Claims 7, 14 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Patterson and in further view of Sommerer (“The Java Archive (JAR) File Format”, by Alan Sommerer in 1998). Claims 8, 15 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Patterson and in further view of Aziz et al. (U.S. Patent 6,597,956). Claims 2-4, 9, 12, 16, 17, 19, 23 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Patterson.

Claims 2-4, 7-9, 12, 14-17, 19, and 21-24

Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 2-4, 7-9, 12, 14-17, 19, and 21-24 are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim and further in view of the additional features of these claims. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 2-4, 7-9, 12, 14-17, 19, and 21-24 are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

ADDITIONAL AMENDMENTS

Claims 26-28 have been newly added by the present Response. Applicant respectfully requests that new Claims 26-28 be included in the Application and considered herewith.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 4, 2007

By: /Nathan L. Feld/

Nathan L. Feld
Reg. No. 59,725

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800